DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 308 IR 004 797

AUTHOR	Herlig, Richard K.; Vandermyn, Gaye
TITLE	Resources for the State Education Agency Dissemination System. Conference Topic Paper.
INSTITUTION	Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 76
NOTE	35p.; Report of First Topical Conference of the National Dissemination Leadership Project (Portland, Oregon, December 13-14, 1976); For related documents, see IR 004 964-65
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Educational Resources; Human Resources; *Information Dissemination; *Information Networks; Information Sources; Information Systems; State Agencies; State Departments of Education; *State Programs; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	ERIC

ABSTRACT

This report presents the information on resources in addition to ERIC which participants shared at the first topical conference for State Education Agency (SEA) personnel. The conference focused on the use and development of education information systems at the state level which go beyond the capacities of the ERIC system. Topics discussed include: (1) state based files on human resources, fugitive files, and program information; (2) national information resources including computerized and non-computerized data sources; (3) issues and concerns; and (4) recommendations. Appended are a list of contact persons by subject area and a glossary of terms. (STS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143308

RESOURCES FOR THE STATE EDUCATION AGENCY DISSEMINATION SYSTEM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONFERENCE TOPIC PAPER

National Dissemination Leadership Project

IR004797

RICHARD K. HERLIG
GAYE VANDERMYN

DECEMBER 1976

EDI

The project reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

EXTRA-ERIC RESOURCES TOPICAL CONFERENCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface i

Introduction 1

State Based Files
  Human Resources
    The Kansas Program 4
    The Alaska Program 6

  Fugitive Files
    San Mateo (CA) Education Resource Center. 8
    The Iowa Program 10

  Promising Programs
    The New York Program 11
    The Texas Program 12

National Resources
  Computerized Data Bases 13

  Non-Computerized Data 15
    National Diffusion Network 15
    NIE Catalog 17
    Laboratory Products 18
    Special Education Materials Center 19

Issues and Concerns 20

Recommendations 21

Appendix A, Resource People 25

Appendix B, Glossary of Terms 27

PREFACE

The National Dissemination Leadership Project (NDLP) is the sponsor of three topical conferences for State Education Agency (SEA) personnel who are assigned to dissemination activities. The purpose: to inform them of the wide variety of information resources now available; to inform them of problem-solving techniques; and to give them an opportunity to share concerns, practices and needs. Perhaps most important, the SEA representatives, after close study of the topic under consideration, produce a series of recommendations aimed at improving current practices.

The first of these topical conferences focused on extra ERIC resources. It was held December 13-14, 1976, in Portland, Oregon. The second conference, "Coordinating the SEA Dissemination Program," was held February 8-9, 1977, in Providence, Rhode Island. The third topical conference will consider "Linker Training Processes," and will be held in Columbia, South Carolina, March 3-4, 1977.

This report presents the information which conference participants shared in Portland on their activities, their concerns and the recommendations they developed for consideration June 20-23, 1977, at the National Dissemination Conference in Washington, D. C.

INTRODUCTION

States initiating the development of an information system find ERIC a logical starting point. ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) is a body of knowledge developed and maintained by the NIE. It provides access to current education research. Once a state education agency has embraced ERIC, however, it finds that ERIC alone falls short of answering the need for information expressed by the educational community. Even the companion ERIC information file -- Current Index to Journals in Education -- is but a half step forward in responding to that need.

SEA representatives met in Portland to consider the what and how of developing SEA information systems that go beyond ERIC. These resources include every kind of information useful to the clients of an SEA information system. Examples include education products such as films, videotapes, project evaluation studies, curriculum guides, people with a special expertise, books, government documents, department policy, governmental rules and regulations, legislation, newsletters, books, newspaper articles, and promising educational programs and practices.

The nearly inexhaustible list of kinds of information which might be included under extra-ERIC resources come in a variety of formats. SEA officials wishing to make this information accessible

to its clients must ask:

What kind of information should be gathered?

How can it be stored so that it can be found and easily retrieved?

Extra-ERIC resources can be divided into state-developed information files and information files developed by others. The latter may include commercial vendors of computerized data bases such as Lockheed or Systems Development Corporation or non-computerized data bases such as the National Diffusion Network or the NIE Catalog. State-developed information files are typically organized into human resources, fugitive files, and promising programs/practices.

Once an SEA has developed its own information system, adding information files developed by others is primarily a question of need, usefulness, cost, and compatibility. A survey of these national information resources was presented at the conference. Workshops on developing state-based files were conducted by state representatives who shared their state's experiences.

The National Dissemination Leadership Project (NDLP), sponsor of the conference, is operated by the Council of Chief State School Officers under a contract from the National Institute of Education (NIE). Its purpose is to facilitate communications among SEA's, NIE, and other agencies and individuals concerned with developing and im-

proving dissemination programs in education at the state and federal levels.

For those confused by various interpretations of the term "dissemination," the work is used in education as an umbrella term to describe a process which permits practitioners, innovators, researchers, and decision-makers to share information efficiently. It is this two-way sharing of information that enables educators to build on what has been done, to learn from others' efforts, to make wiser choices, to identify needs and to marshall more effectively valuable resources for the direct or indirect benefit of the child in the classroom.

STATE-BASED FILES

HUMAN RESOURCES

The workshop on state-based human resources information files was conducted by Nancy Flott, Director, KEDDS Communicate, Kansas State Department of Education; and Robert A. Lehman, Administrator, Development and Dissemination, Alaska Department of Education. Following is a summary of the information they shared with conference participants.

A human resources data base is more than just a list of people. It is a file of information on experts who possess special skills, experience, and understandings and are capable of sharing that with those who have need of it. The human resources file contains information about individuals who can serve as a resource to others. It is sometimes call a consultant file.

The first problem faced by the SEA information system developer is finding these individuals. They can be found everywhere -- the chairman of the curriculum committee, a school district curriculum director, or an individual down the hall in the state education department -- and people in the field can help locate these individuals. The composition of the human resource file should be determined by clients' needs.

The Kansas Program

In Kansas, the resource categories under which the consultants are listed were determined by a task force of Title III facilitators because they are closer to the clients and more aware of their in-

formation needs.

Kansas developed an application form and an evaluation form for consultants. The application form is similar to a job application and actually serves as an application for a consultant's job. It includes a request to list three references.

Evaluation of the consultant can be a difficult problem. Kansas handles it in the following manner: The person requesting a consultant's services is asked to evaluate the quality of services actually received. The consultant is given a copy. An initially poor evaluation may sometimes be unfair to the consultant -- the result of confusion between the client's and the consultant's perception of what kind of service is desired. Since Kansas starts with the references, if a bad or so-so evaluation turns up after the first use of the consultant, the inclusion of the consultant's references may help provide balance until more and fairer evaluations are filed. All evaluations are made available to future customers.

Consultant information is filed on three-by-five cards. Kansas has no immediate plans to place this information in the computer. It has determined that it would be too difficult to make this file ERIC-compatible because of the number of descriptors and identifiers involved. In addition purging of files, always critical in a

human resources information file, is difficult on a computer. For further information, see Appendix A.

The Alaska Program

Alaska's Department of Education developed a human resources information file in 1973 when the state appropriated $60,000 to start a talent bank. State funds pay for the development and operation of the file and underwrite the basic cost of consultant use. The talent bank is used primarily by teachers whose request for technical assistance must be approved by their school superintendent and by school administrators. The consultants are also primarily practitioners -- teachers, administrators, curriculum directors, and university professors. But they also include artists, trades people, craftsmen, musicians, and other professionals from the community. Talent bank funds pay travel expenses and the salary of a substitute teacher. In some cases, an honorarium is provided for members of the talent bank to provide technical assistance.

In the fall of 1976, Alaska published a directory of human resources call the talent bank catalog. Individuals may use the catalog to contact a consultant directly, but if they intend to request talent bank assistance, the request for services must be discussed first with a talent bank coordinator.

One of the early problems Alaska found in use of practitioners as consultants was the number of times they might be called away from their regular classroom duties. This can become a hardship to the district. Hence, the talent bank avoids using practitioner-consultants more than 10 days per year. It is a guarantee local administrators said they needed if they were to cooperate fully in talent bank.

It's a mistake to start too big. Alaska's experience suggests that clear priorities must be set and then an adequate resource file should be developed for those priorities.

After the talent bank was started, Alaska surveyed users and potential users on their primary needs for consultant services. The results showed that reading and basic skills were the two critical areas in which people wanted consultant help. Alaska focused on these priority areas and now believes it can offer better expertise with special skills.

Using specific criteria for selection of consultants will help maintain quality and the quantity of services delivered if coordinators use the same criteria when assigning consultants to a particular situation. In Alaska, the criteria for selection of reading consultants are basically the same criteria developed by the

federal Right-to-Read programs. For additional information, see Appendix A.

FUGITIVE FILES

The workshop on state-based fugitive files was conducted by Frank Mattas, Administrator/Director, SMERC (San Mateo, Calif. Educational Resource Center) and Mary Jo Bruett, Iowa Department of Public Instruction. Following is a summary of the information they shared with conference participants.

Mattas' Report

Fugitive materials are primarily teacher-developed. They include the kind of information collected in vertical files. The process of developing this information file involves three basic steps. First, list the five most important issues of teachers. The list varies little from one locale to another. A list of the current 10 top national concerns in education follow:

1. Teacher demands -- collective bargaining;
2. Accountability;
3. Learning disabilities;
4. Vandalism;
5. Reports to parents;
6. Community support -- taxes, levies, elections;
7. Reading;
8. Declining enrollment;
9. Mini-courses;
10. Conservation/energy.

Collect materials on the top five interests. Form an "upflow/downflow" system to gather material. To start, call someone in the curriculum area of a county or regional office. Say that you are developing resources on, for example, learning disabilities. Ask for whatever documents the office has on that topic. Ask for names to call at the district office level. Then work down through the established line of communications to the local education agencies. At each level find the curriculum persons. Give them a form which has a space to fill out the identifier/descriptors. Give them broad categories. Collect this form with the actual documents. SMERC does very little validation. Instead, it relies on local screening. Report their claim of success.

The third step is to let people know that these materials exist. One of the single greatest faults of information centers is waiting for something to happen. Don't wait. Send out catalogs, newsletters, and bulletins that tell what resources are available.

SMERC publishes a newsletter every other month. On the odd months, SMERC conducts an in-depth search on a major topic and publishes a resource guide which is distributed to tne local education agencies. With volume, SMERC can publich a four-color copy for 47 cents each.

Most states can figure that document reproduction will cost about $25,000 annually. Fortunately, people will buy the resource documents and catalogs, thus defraying part of the cost.

Bruett's Report

The Iowa Information Center is located in the state library. This offers some definite advantages. The state printer automatically sends two copies of every document the state prints to the library. Participation in the inter-library loan allows retrieval of about 89 percent of all journal articles without having to duplicate the storage of highly specialized journals.

Criteria which Iowa applies to fugitive files documents are the same used for all bibliographic materials. A critical problem in developing fugitive files is the time involved in abstracting documents. The cost factor is prohibitive if the abstracting is done completely by the information center personnel. Instead, get the originator, the consultants, or the linkers to write a 200 to 300 word abstract. For additional information, see Appendix A.

PROMISING PROGRAMS

The workshop on promising programs/practices was conducted by Gregory Benson, EPSIS, New York State Education Department; and Patrick Martin, Program Director, Texas Education Agency. Following is a summary of the information they shared with conference participants.

Benson's Report

The New York State Department of Education defines promising practices as programs. In developing a promising programs information file, it had to answer two system requirements: access by content and retention of the integrity of the title programs. The ERIC format was selected because it is the most sophisticaed educational data base, the most frequently used, the easiest to use, and is an existing format. However, it added an evaluation type code of eight numbers to the ERIC format which indicates what kind of evaluation material is available on each program. It simply reports what evaluations have been made and avoids attempting to screen programs for listing by a validation process. This process is responsive to teachers' requests for a full listing of programs in their interest area, thus permitting clients to evaluate the usefulness of the program for themseves. The numerical code used in the information files is as follows:

Significance	cognitive	Affective	Psychomotor	Institutional
Educational	1	2	3	4
Statistical	5	6	7	8

Other information included in the file: the initiation date of the program; its funding source; and whether it can provide infor

mation and help to interested persons or school districts. Curriculum materials are generally housed where they are produced at all levels. Clients, 75 per cent of whom are teachers, are provided computer printouts. A client who wants the hard copy can obtain it from the producer.

Personnel at the BOCES (intermediate) level are trained to report on the programs in New York format. Program abstracts are written at that level. Education department product producers write their own program abstracts. For additional information, see Appendix A.

Martin's Report

Program validation is a high priority in Texas. The Texas Department of Education's information system will provide information on nonvalidated programs, but it promotes the adoption and adaption of validated programs by making money available to school districts for that purpose. Clients, therefore, are most interested in information on validated programs. Texas had 35 model programs in its "Demonstration Schools Network" the first year. It will include 79 demonstration schools next year.

The first step in identifying demonstration schools is a letter which is sent to get nominations from the districts. The letters ask the district to check eligibility criteria and to fill out a self-evaluation form. The second step is to send a team of

educators to the school to conduct an evaluation. The team includes an educational service center person and a person from a local school, both of whom are from another region. Program validation is based on this evaluation.

Information center clients request information from their regional educational service center. Texas established 20 such centers 10 years ago. The centers request "search packages" from the state dissemination office. The packages contain ERIC hard copies, names and a list of state-file resources. The package is sent to the educational service center which gives on-the-spot technical assistance as it is needed by the client. For additional information, see Appendix A.

NATIONAL RESOURCES

Computerized Data Bases

Kurt Heeley, Supervisor, Reference and Information Services, Colorado Department of Education, presented a report on computerized data bases. Following is a summary of the information he shared with conference participants.

The technology is here to drive down costs of using computerized data bases available through commercial vendors. It is becoming increasingly important for SEA information system personnel to keep informed about up-to-date costs and improvements in equipment.

New information files are being added almost monthly to the data bases available from commercial vendors. Lockheed now lists 50 information files and has announced plans to add another half-dozen files within three months. Two of those are abstracts of Washington newspaper articles and the Federal Register. The Federal Register will be available for search through the Lockheed system one week after publication. Currently it requires 10 days after publication to receive it by mail.

The New York Times, through the FDS communications lines, makes available commercially computer searches of abstracts of newspaper articles from the Times, the Kansas City Star, The Chicago Tribune, and the major news magazines.

Other information files available from Lockheed include: American history and life; historical abstracts; agriculture; food sciences; and child abuse/neglect.

A new service by National Information Center for Education Media (NICEM) will make available a monthly updated information file on nonprint education media. More than 400,000 listings will be included.

Information needs for current data on school law can be obtained from LEXIS, a service offered by the University of Ohio.

This file includes the U.S. Code, district court case law, state constitutions, and statutes. For further information, see Appendix B. Keeley's paper is available from CCSSO.

NON-COMPUTERIZED DATA

National Diffusion Network

Ann E. Matthews, Director, Research and Development Utilization Project, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, presented a report on the National Diffusion Network. A summary follows:

The National Diffusion Network (NDN) got its start in fiscal 1974 with funding under the discretionary portion of Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

NDN enables school districts in need of a solution to a particular problem to adopt or adapt a program that has already proved itself to be effective in solving that problem. The programs, roughly 160 in number and from almost every state, were originally funded as experimental programs under Title III, Title I (Compensatory Education) or Right-to-Read. Each was tried out in a local school system, usually for three to five years. Each program also had to be "validated" by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel, whose members are drawn from the U.S. Office of Education and the National Institute of Education. The criteria used for evaluation are mainly cognitive test scores and pre- and post-test data. In addition to proving its

effectiveness, however, each program also had to prove to the panel's staisfaction that there was a good chance that the same program would be successful if used in a different setting, with different children and a different teacher. The last proof that the panel required was that the program be cost effective. The least clearly defined of the three criteria, cost effectiveness, in most cases meant that the program could give approximate costs for another district to adopt it.

Each approved program became eligible to receive funds as a "Developer-Demonstrator." This means the federal government, working through the states, would provide funds for dissemination activities. The model program served as a demonstration site. Often its staff members visited other schools and other states to help interested school districts adopt the program in their own settings. Monitoring and follow-up activities were often provided as well as inservice training for an entire staff or a teacher trainer who would in turn train others to use the methods and materials that made the model work.

As another part of its effort to make the NDN work, the federal government funded "state facilitators" in more than 70 per cent of the states. Although the state facilitators worked differently in each state, their main function was the same: to

help the school districts in the state learn about the model programs that met those needs. The school districts were under no obligation to adopt the programs and, even if they did, the programs could be modified somewhat to meet local conditions. One of the chief advantages of the NDN, according to a federal spokesman, is that it offers districts cheap inservice training in a successful way to teach reading, math, language arts, environmental education, the arts, and most any other part of the school curriculum or school problem. For additional information, see Appendix A.

NIE CATALOG

Marie E. Shepardson, Center for Educational Policy Management, University of Oregon, presented a report on the NIE Catalog. A summary follows:

The NIE Catalog lists 600 products, the majority of which was produced by federally supported research and development laboratories and educational centers. Each entry contains the developers' description of the product. The catalog lists two kinds of products -- those that have been commercially printed and the locally reproduced thin market publications.

One means of getting at the information in the NIE Catalog is through the Educational Dissemination and Linkage Source Book.

Subject listings in this book give short descriptions of the product and the NIE Catalog page reference. The linkage source book also lists product information specialists and product utilization specialists. Plans have been discussed to put the catalog on ERIC, but no decision has been reached. For further information, see Appendix A.

LABORATORY PRODUCTS

Jerry Kirkpatrick, Director of Resources Development, Far West Laboratory, presented a report on the products of the education laboratories, supported in part by the NIE. A summary follows:

One of the problems with the NIE Catalog is that it took 18 months to develop. It was out-of-date by the time it was published. All of the federally supported labs and educational centers have some products which are not listed.

All labs have lists and catalogs of specialized products for which they will provide upon request. They should be contacted directly for current materials.

NIE's Feed Forward System should not be viewed by SEA's as another competing information network or dissemination system. Indeed, it should be regarded as a source of technical assistance for dissemination techniques to the states. The important question is

what can be done by one of the five centers to help each state implement its plan. For further information, see Appendix A.

SPECIAL EDUCATION MATERIALS CENTER

Wayne Lance, Director, Northwest Area Learning Resource Center, University of Oregon, presented a report on Information Resources in Special Education. A summary follows:

The 12 per cent of the school population which has been identified as handicapped needs special materials. Teachers and parents want to know where they can be found and for what skills materials are available. That information can be obtained from 13 area learning resource centers which house learning media in special education. They deal with appraisal and programs. In addition, there is a National Center for Media and Materials with four specialized offices. For more information, see Appendix A.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

One of the purposes of the Extra-ERIC Resources Topical Conference in Portland was to clarify issues of concern to the states which have begun developing these resources. Both practical and conceptual concerns evolved from two small-group brainstorming sessions.

Discussions on issues centered on the need for a conceptual framework for dissemination that would be adopted and used by all federal funding agencies and the states.

The SEA Dissemination Concept, developed by the Interstate Project on Dissemination (IPOD), of four overlapping components -- management, information, incentives, and linkage -- was felt by conference participants to have been a useful framework for a given number of states at a particular point in time. It was felt, however, that development of SEA dissemination systems have now progressed beyond that point and the IPOD concept needs to be examined and refined.

Expressed concerns included degree of overlap in functions and activities, detailed listings of activities which need to be included in an effective system, where a communication function should be placed, and an elaboration of necessary management activities.

Other concerns discussed at the conference included problems of purgible files and compatibility among SEA dissemination systems that could permit a nationwide sharing of information.

Following the brainstorming sessions, each group's listing of issues and concerns were discussed, combined, and prioritized. An ad hoc group of participants met to refine recommendations developed from the discussion.

Recommendations

Recommendations from the Topical Conference, Portland, Oregon to be considered by the National Dissemination Representatives at the National Conference, June 20, 1977 in Washington, D. C.

1. A communications network should be developed to:
   -- provide continuous updating to the states concerning available information resources; and
   -- provide sample guidelines for information resource system development to states that have not yet developed an information system.

2. All education resources developed at the federal level (OE, NIE) or regional levels (OE, labs, centers) or state and local levels should use ERIC thesaurus terminology.

3. The development of resource systems should be responsive to client needs.

4. The information resources component should be institutionalized as a critical and necessary function of the State Education Agency.

5. State Education Agencies should develop and utilize fugitive state and regional materials files.

The group generated other recommendations not specific to the SEA resource component. These are:

1. Define roles of federal, regional, state, and local participants.

2. Provide increased training and technical assistance to states receiving Capacity Building Grants in response to their expressed needs.

3. Define responsibilities of the Capacity Building evaluation contractor to include serving as a source of information and of the National Dissemination Leadership Project as a major vehicle for delivering that information.

4. Current federally funded dissemination efforts such as the

Capacity Building grants should be strengthened before new ones are launched.

5. The federal level should initiate a collaborative effort through an ad hoc group which involves State Education Agency and other major research, development, and dissemination participants (e.g., CEDaR, National Diffusion Network, ERIC Clearinghouses) to develop a conceptual framework which encompasses such issues as roles and relationships, legal analysis, and funding.

6. The federal government should expand the Capacity Building Grant program by increasing the length of funding, increasing the amount of funding per grant, and adding additional funding for states not currently funded.

APPENDIX A

State Based Files	Contact Persons
The Kansas Program	Nancy Flott, Director (313) 296-3136 KEDDS Resource Component State Department of Education Topeka, Kansas 66612
The Alaska Program	Robert A. Lehman (907) 465-2812 Administrator, Development and Diss. Alaska Dept. of Education, Pouch F Juneau, Alaska 99811
Fugitive Files	
San Mateo Educational Resource Center	Frank Mattas (415) 364-5600, X4404 Administrator/Director, SMERC 333 Main Street Redwood City, California 94063
The Iowa Program	Mary Jo Bruett (515) 281-3475 Educational Media Center State Department of Public Instruction Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Promising Programs	
The New York Program	Gregory M. Benson, Jr. (518) 474-3639 Coordinator of EPSIS State Department of Education Albany, New York 12234
The Texas Program	Patrick Martin (512) 475-5601 Program Director Texas Education Agency Austin, Texas 78701
National Resources	
Computerized Data Bases	Kurt Keeley (303) 892-2171 Colorado State Library 1362 Lincoln Denver, Colorado 80203
Non-Computerized Data Bases	
National Diffusion Network	Ann Matthews (503) 248-6806 Northwest Regional Educational Lab. 710 S.W. Second Avenue Portland, Oregon 97204

NIE Catalog	Marie E. Shepardson (503) 686-5087 Center for Educational Policy and Management University of Oregon 1472 Kincaid Eugene, Oregon 97403
Laboratory Products	Jerry D. Kirkpatrick (503) 248-6806 Northwest Regional Educational Lab 710 S.W. Second Avenue Portland, Oregon 97204
Special Education Materials Center	Wayne Lance (503) 686-3111 University of Oregon Director, N.W. Area Learning Resource Center Eugene, Oregon 97403

APPENDIX B

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

NATIONAL DISSEMINATION LEADERSHIP PROJECT

EXTRA ERIC RESOURCES CONFERENCE

KURT MATHEW KEELEY

COLORADO STATE LIBRARY

DENVER, COLORADO

December 13-14, 1976
Portland, Oregon

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Bibliographic Access
: The ability to identify a unique item from a standard description of it.

Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Terminal
: A computer terminal which provides a video display of data.

Computer Network
: An interconnection of assemblies of computer systems, terminals and communications facilities.

Data Base
: A file of data, usually in machine-readable language.

Document Delivery
: Process by which information in any format is provided to the requestor.

Guaranteed Access
: The assurance that a designated item is owned by and may be obtained from a designated resource facility. (Guaranteed access does not imply guaranteed immediate availability.)

Hard Copy
: A paper copy of a document; usually a full-size (100%) reproduction of the original done via Xerox or similar process, though reduced size two-up copies may also be made.

Hardware
: Physical equipment used in a computer system, as opposed to a software program or method of use (e.g., mechanical, magnetic, electrical or electronic devices).

Information
: Facts or data; knowledge

Interactive
: Pertaining to exchange of information and control between a user and a computer process, or between computer processes.

Interlibrary Loan
: A transaction in which library material is made available by one library to another for the use of an individual; includes the provision of a copy as substitute for loan of the original material.

Keyword
: Each word of interest which describes subject or context of a document. Sometimes, but not necessarily, restricted to title.

Library Network

Formal organization among libraries for cooperation and sharing of resources, usually with an explicitly hierarchial structure, in which the group as a whole is organized into subgroups with the expectation that most of the needs of a library will be satisfied within the subgroup of which it is a member.

Literature Search

A systematic and exhaustive search for published material bearing on a specific subject. An intermediate stage between reference work and research, and differentiated from both.

Mini-Computer

A computer having a 4K memory at least and a usable range between 16 to 64K. Cost range between $10,000-$100,000.

National Library Network

An independent agency responsible for providing resource and bibliographic support and the necessary communications linkages for libraries and information systems nationwide.

Network

(1) An interconnected or interrelated group of nodes. (2) In connection with a disciplinary or problem-oriented qualifier, the combination of material, documentation, and human resources that are united by design to achieve certain objectives.

Off-Line System

A system in which processes are carried out by the computer's central processing unit usually at a faster rate than on-line. For example, off-line citations are printed at the computer site on a high speed printer and mailed to the requestor, but this mode does not allow for immediate feedback.

On-Line Search

A system in which peripheral devices are in direct and continuing communication with the central processor of the computer. With an on-line system, interaction between computer and searcher during the search process allows immediate feedback of results and immediate modification of the search request when desired.

Physical Access

The ability to obtain the material item desired.

Private Sector

Includes organizations outside of government such as profit-making companies and nont-for-profit institutions, which process, store, or disseminate information.

Public Sector

Library and information activities directly affiliated with local, state, and federal government.

Recorded Information

Facts or data which have been recorded in books, periodicals, newspapers, reports, audiovisual formats, magnetic tapes, data bases, and other recording media.

Region

A group of states with contiguous boundaries organized to provide specified support services to libraries.

Resource Availability

The set of conditions (accessible, on the shelf, and a method for delivery) which enable the actual delivery of an item to the requestor.

Resource Sharing

The joint use of resources available to a network by a number of dispersed users.

Retrieval

The process of identifying, locating, and securing research and development information.

Search Strategy

A plan in which the searcher first identifies and selects the most appropriate term or terms, and decides which Boolean combinations will effect the desired results.

Selective Dissemination of Information

A current awareness service based on the provision of document references for a set of concepts developed for the recipient; new references are provided as the data bases are updated.

Software

A set of computer programs, procedures, rules and associated documentation concerned with the operation of computers. Compare: hardware

State Library/Library Agency

The instrumentality of the state with designated responsibility for intrastate library development.

Statewide Network

The organization of libraries and library service agencies within a state to coordinate and support the provision of services to all citizens of the state.

System

A set of component devices and people, carrying out operations and procedures in a clearly defined manner for the accomplishment of established objectives.

Technology

The body of methods and materials used to apply science to a given objective.

Terminal

A device that permits data entry into or data exit from a computer system or network (e.g. a data capture device, a teletypewriter or a computer). Terminals may accommodate data in human or machine-readable form.

Text Processing

Ability to handle strings of data, character strings; string searching; need text processing to do word processing.

Thesaurus

A collection of words or terms used to classify, index, store, and retrieve information in a data base. They usually are descriptors, keywords, or data elements found in the text or data being indexed. The entries may be single or multiple words.

Types of Libraries

(1) Academic: college and university libraries. (2) School: elementary, secondary and technical school libraries. (3) Government: libraries serving agencies of federal and state governments. (May also be sub-classified in other types.) (4) Public: general libraries supported by public funds and providing services to all individuals residing within the pertinent political jurisdiction. (5) Special: libraries providing particular materials and services to identified clientele in specific subject areas; includes business and industrial, legal, medical, subject-oriented research and some federal government libraries.

Word Processing

Processing of textual information.

SOURCES CONSULTED

Resources and Bibliographic Support for a Nationwide Library Program. Rockville, Maryland, National Commission for Libraries and Information Science, 1974, pp. X-XV. (WESTAT Report)

Yarborough, Judith. How to Prepare for a Computer Search of ERIC: A Non-Technical Approach: Appendix B. In Information Reports and Bibliographies, Vol. 4, No. 5, 1975, pp. 19-21.

Lockheed Information Retrieval Services. DIALOG Terminal Users Reference Manual. Part 1. Looseleaf.